

M@n@gement

ISSN: 1286-4692

Emmanuel Josserand, *CMOS, University of Technology, Sydney (Editor in Chief)*

Jean-Luc Arrègle, *EMLYON Business School (editor)*

Laure Cabantous, *Cass Business School (editor)*

Stewart Clegg, *University of Technology, Sydney (editor)*

Olivier Germain, *Université du Québec à Montréal (editor, book reviews)*

Karim Mignonac, *Université de Toulouse 1 (editor)*

Philippe Monin, *EMLYON Business School (editor)*

Tyrone Pitsis, *University of Newcastle (editor)*

José Pla-Barber, *Universidad de València (editor)*

Michael Tushman, *Harvard Business School (editor)*

Walid Shibbib, *Université de Genève (managing editor)*

Alexander Bell, *Université de Genève (editorial assistant)*

Martin G. Evans, *University of Toronto (editor emeritus)*

Bernard Forgues, *EMLYON Business School (editor emeritus)*

Special Issue

■ Olivier GERMAIN
Emmanuel JOSSERAND 2013
The M@n@gement journey, spanning boundaries
and navigating at the fringe
M@n@gement, 16(5), 535-546.

M@n@gement est la revue officielle de l'AIMS



M@n@gement is the journal official of AIMS

Copies of this article can be made free of charge and without securing permission, for purposes of teaching, research, or library reserve. Consent to other kinds of copying, such as that for creating new works, or for resale, must be obtained from both the journal editor(s) and the author(s).

M@n@gement is a double-blind refereed journal where articles are published in their original language as soon as they have been accepted.

For a free subscription to M@n@gement, and more information:
<http://www.management-aims.com>

© 2013 M@n@gement and the author(s).

The M@n@gement journey, spanning boundaries and navigating at the fringe

Olivier GERMAIN

Université du Québec à Montréal
germain.olivier@uqam.ca

Emmanuel JOSSERAND

CMOS, University of Technology, Sydney
emmanuel.josserand@uts.edu.au

INTRODUCTION

A few weeks ago, one of the co-authors of this paper received a rejection from an FT listed journal. There is nothing in itself extraordinary in this: we are all used to rejections. The paper did have weaknesses and we could understand why it might have been rejected. What was remarkable about the decision was its concision and the motive presented for it. No justification was given beyond the following sentence: “a primary reason for rejecting the manuscript is that your research explores a unique case, which does not have applicability to many situations”. While the reviewers had picked out some of the other weaknesses of the paper, the main reason for rejection seemed genuinely to be the specificity of the case study (the French context) and the fact that it only examined a single case. What seemed to us an extraordinary opportunity to study this research topic, one that had been recurrently identified by other scholars as important, was seen by the reviewers as lacking possibilities of generalization. Among others, Bent Flyvbjerg (2006) suggests that it is conventional to assume that single case studies cannot be used to inform generalizations and do not therefore contribute significantly to scientific progress. He advocates and emphasizes the usefulness of “black swans” as a supplement or alternative to other methods, while suggesting that “formal generalization is overvalued as a source of scientific development, whereas ‘the force of example’ is underestimated” (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 228). This implies that academic journals are aware of this approach and, more widely, of the richness and diversity of research.

Of course, we are not (only) telling this story because it is rare to be able to complain about a rejection in front of a large audience. More importantly, it is related to the story of *M@n@gement*, its origin and its mission in the ocean of academic journals. One of the starting points for the journal was, as argued by Bernard Forgues and Sebastien Liarte (2013), to create a high quality journal that could overcome language barriers and improve knowledge of rigorous revision processes in the French-speaking and European academic world. Academic communities have been enlivened by some vigorous debates on the contemporary dominance of the English language, the meaning systems tied to it and the micro-political issues associated with it that impact upon management and organization studies (Tietze, 2013 ; Grey, 2010 quoted by Tietze, 2013). One may submit her/his manuscript to *M@n@gement* in her/

his native language (French, German or Spanish): the journal asks for an English translation if the piece is accepted and the paper is also edited in its original language. Our editorial policy is unique in this respect for identities and styles of narration. *M@n@gement* has helped break down cultural as well as linguistic barriers. It has managed to do this through its openness and by offering tribunes to different research traditions, thus accommodating a broad variety of contributions, from publications typical of the “French style” to more mainstream papers written by preeminent “international” scholars. The importance of breaking cultural barriers should not be underestimated. They have been discussed in various fields, including those of the Humanities (Chanlat, 2008), Social and Cultural Anthropology (Freedman, 1979), Cross-Cultural Organizational Behavior (Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, A. Z., 2007), Economics (Johnson, 1973), Management of Information Systems, Psychotherapy (Orlinsky, 1989), Education (Robinson-Pant, 2005) and Business (Sullivan & Weaver, 2000). A key conclusion of this research is that different cultures research differently, perhaps because they rely on different philosophical traditions (Santistevan & Karjalainen, 2013). This led some of our colleagues in Management of Information Systems to ask, in the European Journal of Information Systems “Why the old world cannot publish?” (Lyytinen, Baskerville, Iivari & Te’eni, 2007). Well, for the last 15 years, they have been able to publish in *M@n@gement*. The gradual recognition of our journal in international rankings shows that its unique stance, amid the jungle of academic journals, has proved fruitful.

This special issue is a fantastic demonstration of the deep roots *M@n@gement* has put down in the international community and its capacity to attract contributions from the best scholars. Some say that we are now too international and that we have lost our ‘soul’; such comments are probably the price one pays for success. However, as underlined by Forgues & Liarte (2013), although *M@n@gement* is slowly being institutionalized, its position is still fragile and, while keeping its French/European roots is important, international branches are equally fundamental if we want to continue to span boundaries of culture, nation and research tradition, as we have in the past. The rules of the game are such that this key achievement of the journal would be at risk if its international impact were to diminish rather than grow. But we know that institutionalization can come at a cost, that of diminishing creativity. New ventures (here, *M@n@gement*) evolving in an emerging field (open access journals) have at first to establish in a proactive way their legitimacy and to conform to a set of strong rules as set down here by the former organizational field (Zimmerman et Zeitz, 2002). The collective identity of a nascent entrepreneurial group is more likely to be legitimated and can empower isolated creative behaviors (Wry et al., 2011), which may have emerged through the creation of more open access journals.

M@n@gement has successfully explored another boundary in its exposure of ideas at the fringes of our field, through an openness to all types of methods and paradigms. It thus has combined new ideas with more established ones, notably through ambitious special issues and creative “unplugged” essays. Reflexivity has also been part of the *M@n@gement* journey, appearing in epistemological and methodological papers, some of which take the form of research notes. *M@n@gement* has even enjoyed publishing papers that make incursions into other disciplines. In its way, *M@n@gement* tries to respond

to regular calls for “conceptual blending”, the term for when the constructs, theories and approaches of two fields merge to generate new perspectives in order to transform the core of a topic (Oswick, Fleming and Hanlon, 2011). At the same time, our journal acknowledges a large range of attempts to build theories at the intersection of fields, maximizing the impact of management, strategy and organization studies. This research then borrows and replicates or extends existing theories from other fields (Zhara and Newey, 2009). As Augier and March (2011) remind us in their fascinating exploration of the roots of North American business schools after the Second World War, this “principle” of interdisciplinary research was at the heart of the creation of organizational sciences at Carnegie School.

When we decided to celebrate the 15th anniversary of the journal, we brought together a group of scholars who would represent the journey the journal has taken and who would be likely to propose more transgression of convention, to span boundaries, to discuss established ideas and to reflect on our researchers’ practices. All the scholars have a connection with the journal, some of them having served as editors (Stewart Clegg, Olivier Germain and Linda Rouleau), editors in chief (Bernard Forgues and Emmanuel Josserand) and editorial assistants (Sebastien Liarte, also co-editor in chief). The results have been staggering. An incredible group of scholars was formed and have sent us some wonderful proposals. The first series of papers is illustrative of recent efforts to renew fields such as strategy-as-practice (Linda Rouleau), socio-materiality (Paula A. Jarzabkowski and Trevor Pinch) and performance-as-practice (Stéphane Guérard, Ann Langley and David Seidl). The second group practices renewal through interdisciplinarity (Stewart Clegg and Robert van Krieken, Eero Vaara and Ann Reff Pedersen, as well as Hugh Willmott and Jeroen Veldman) and suggests ways of contributing across disciplines (Mie Augier). Meanwhile, some of the most radical ideas of this special issue are to be found in the papers of André Spicer, Robert Chia, Stephen Linstead as well as Paula A. Jarzabkowski and Trevor Pinch. The four next contributors offer exercises of reflexivity and give us their perspectives on the difficulties and challenges of “good” research (James March, Yiannis Gabriel, Bill Starbuck and Joel Baum). Finally, we conclude with the contribution of Bernard Forgues and Sébastien Liarte, which tells the story of the field and of *M@n@gement* itself in view of the recent evolution of open access publishing.

SHIFTING BOUNDARIES WITHIN THE FIELD

In fifteen years, *M@n@gement* has witnessed both continuity and change in the organization, strategy and management fields. As Linda Rouleau points out in her essay, the rapid emergence of strategy-as-practice (SaP) research is one of the most promising, rejuvenating and “energetic” streams in the strategy field. Furthermore, it brings together questions of strategy and questions of organization. If we view strategy as a tangle of micro-socially embedded practices and everyday coping actions, we must subscribe to an updating of a discipline which is currently being partly stripped of the elements upon which, historically, it was based: predictive ability, deliberate intention and instrumental, predetermined action.

Linda Rouleau not only takes stock of the progress in this research stream but considers SaP research to be at a crossroads. First, she highlights the multiple underlying approaches of practice, all of which aim to inform the “doing” of strategy. Some views are closer to the mainstream approach of strategy research as they update or improve the content view of strategy. Others put a focus on strategy as a subjective discourse that influences everyday life and address the formation of power effects in strategy practices. A few views, meanwhile, are truly rooted in social sciences theories and sociological views of practice. Second, Linda Rouleau points out that new ideas generated in foundational SaP texts are partly based on a distinctive merging and re-assembly of classical metaphors with theoretical concepts and empirical materials. She then suggests that SaP research face two main challenges. The diversity or the relative disintegration of the body of knowledge under the umbrella construct of practice may reveal that it’s time to consolidate gains in order to control the growth of the field. This consolidation requires the fostering of specific theoretical contributions. The field should also take advantage of new ethnographic methods to address research issues more accurately. At the same time, however, comparative ethnographic research may sustain cumulative knowledge production to help better revisit today’s strategic issues. Performance has always been part of the vocabulary of strategy. Some would even consider that the strategy discipline was created to come to grips with this particular issue at the firm level. Stéphane Guérard, Ann Langley and David Seidl bring out in their essay how the concept may be revisited and renewed thanks to theoretical findings partly rooted in the SAP stream. The authors point out that some views extend the mainstream approach of performance as they maintain the positivist ontology of performance as a separate reality. On the one hand, performance should be addressed at a more disaggregated level of analysis so as to be closer to the phenomena studied and to the chain of consequences leading to performance. On the other hand, process studies may provide a richer understanding of performance building in suggesting a dynamic approach including performance as an input and as an outcome and how they relate to each other over time. Guérard et al. submit a radical re-problematization of performance much more consistent with a practice based ontology. A performative view allows us to re-consider performance as something people do rather than as a property of organizations. Performance is thus clearly related to the intertwining of everyday practices in situated contexts and claims and discourses about strategy.

In the very variety of strategy-as-practice views, some researches highlight the role and prevalence of materials in strategizing and stress the importance of the “materializing” of discourses within strategic texts. Of course, socio-materiality aims to inspect the material facets of technology and organization with a broader scope. Paula Jarzabkowski and Trevor Pinch, in the special issue, question the socio-materiality stream in its ability to become more than a research fashion. They note that socio-materiality is divided into two schools – “affordance” and “scripts” approaches – which address the way objects may be re-purposed in situated interactions (affordance view) and how materials inscribe and prescribe sequences of actions (script view). According to the authors, both views tend to focus on the materials themselves and thus misdirect attention from social interactions in which activities are accomplished and objects are entangled. The “accomplishing” view, suggested by Jarzabkowski

and Pinch, is to complement those previous views and examine activities and materials, “as they are accomplished with objects in a multiplicity of contexts”. The use of material possibilities allows us “to repair the affordances contained in the materials and enable the material script to progress”.

DISMANTLING BOUNDARIES BETWEEN DISCIPLINES

Interdisciplinarity in organizational and management studies constitutes an avenue to generate promising theories and research questions in the extent that, as mentioned previously, it is not only an “import-export” process. Four contributions offer various representations of interdisciplinarity between management studies and other social sciences and humanities. More widely, lots of authors in this anniversary issue are used to using ideas and theories from other fields to feed their thought.

A true example of “conceptual blending”, Eero Vaara and Ann Reff Pedersen’s essay echoes the words of Linda Rouleau about the ramifications of SaP research and enriches the discursive turn of strategic practice by borrowing the Bakhtinian concept of the “chronotope”. Vaara and Pedersen elucidate the processes through which understandings of time and space are constructed in strategy narratives and enrich the understanding of how exactly strategy narratives construct the past, present, and future. The authors depart from the usual notion of “chronological” time and apply to narratives of strategy Bakhtin’s “chronotope”, the literary construct of time in which space is required as a reference point. They combine this with Ricoeur’s “meaning-based approach” to time in order to configure a new method of viewing past, present and future in the context of strategy. Strategizing is “reproblematized” as a creative activity, “both enabled and constrained by readily available forms”. The essay underscores that alternative antenarratives become living stories and institutionalized strategies and allow us to consider how strategy-making is based on dialogicality and polyphony. The detour through Bakhtin’s as well as Ricoeur’s worlds not only extends but deeply enriches the way we deal with the narrative construction of strategies in organizations.

Lots of works in organizational science and strategic management have been dedicated to questioning and defining the nature and the frontiers of the firm, widely rooted in organizational economics and corporate finance theories. Some may consider this excessive and think that ultimately, it simply weakens the frontiers of... management studies. Contrariwise, Hugh Willmott and Jeroen Veldman point out that management and organization studies surprisingly have never really thought about or “thematized” the corporation, which remains a shadow concept in the field. Seriously, what is a corporation? Interdisciplinarity also takes shape in imagination and myths underlying our theories and conceptualizations. Willmott and Veldman scrutinize how the corporation is a performative product of three analytically distinctive but in practice compounded imaginaries: legal, economic and political. These “imaginaries” give access to what we label as a “corporation”. They consistently enact and embody various social phenomena, and become a political and performative discourse. The essay offers a remarkable journey into some legal and neo-liberal economic imaginaries as well as a new lens throughout which to view them. It does this by highlighting the transition from the “corporate entity” to the “legal fiction” and the consequences of that transition. Willmott

and Veldman point to the prevalence of political imaginaries in concepts of the corporation and advocate a “de-reification” of it so as to understand corporate form as “a network of social and productive relationships”. This paper suggests nothing less than a reconstruction of corporate governance which means re-attributing agency to the corporate entity: “its assets are indivisibly social, and not private, property”!

Interdisciplinary approaches may be organized around borrowing a specific concept, as Eero Vaara and Ann Reff Pedersen do, or embracing a more general “platform” as a coherent framework which facilitates the understanding or exploration of organizational phenomena. Stewart Clegg and Ad van Irterson root their essay in contemporary classical sociology and suggest that this approach should be prevalent in organization studies because it allows us to develop imagination. They try to address in an innovative manner how the liquefying boundaries of space, time and organizations impact or alter employee behavior. The uniqueness of their paper consists, *inter alia*, of the integration in the same framework of both an inspiring author, Norbert Elias, and his main opponent, Hans Peter Duerr. One may sometimes blame researchers in organization studies for borrowing locked and homogeneous theories without viewing them through critical lenses. Elias points out the effects of the social structure of human behavior, from an historical long-term perspective. Duerr enriches Elias’ thesis with aspects of physical proximity and distance which are at best implicit in the former thesis. According to authors, these theories may inform trends such as distance work, inter-organizational cooperation and dedifferentiation as liquid phenomena “may bestow organizational members with a varying need for self-regulation”. Management and organizational studies should therefore address more fully the effects of physical distance/proximity and of interdependence of work activities on social control and self-regulation.

As mentioned above, Carnegie School delivered two pieces that are both considered as matrixes for organizational studies and the influence of which has spread into various streams of research: March and Simon’s 1958 *Organizations* and Cyert and March’s 1963 *The Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. As mentioned by Mie Augier, the foundation of Carnegie was characterized by the absence of true experts in... organization studies; some founding members came from the fields of, amongst others, informatics, cognitive sciences, mathematics, the arts and economics. This interdisciplinarity “by necessity” generated a unique view of organizations and constituted the organizing principle that is so important to management and organization studies.

Research-ing is also an organizational practice embedded in multiple flows of action: Mie Augier offers in her history-based essay a thick description of the social, institutional and intellectual context from which *The Behavioral Theory of the Firm* emerged fifty years ago, celebrating another anniversary. She explains the reviews and reception which *The Behavioral Theory of the Firm* received in 1953. One of the most interesting comes for Sydney Winter who saw the book as developing an alternative to neoclassic theory. Augier is certain of the direct engagement of Jim March and Richard Cyert with the disciplines they solicited to construct their theory and her essay shows how *The Behavioral Theory of the Firm* impacted various disciplines including economics, political science, population ecology and psychology.

Interdisciplinarity is not only carried out by individual researchers; it is also considered a legitimate venture for a field as a whole to undertake. Research should be a conversation with other disciplines, not a one way monologue.

PLAYING AT THE FRINGE WITH PROVOKINGLY NEW IDEAS

Interdisciplinarity is a source of freedom and of creativity, in that it arouses deviance in otherwise institutionalized research fields. One needs to brand or label deviant ideas by producing strong narrations to enhance the legitimacy of new materials. Terms, sentences, metaphors and symbols have a performative effect within scientific communities. André Spicer, Robert Chia and Stephen Linstead suggest three terms that could be used to nourish strategic and organizational thinking and may, perhaps unfortunately, reflect contemporary organizational life: bullshit, strategic indirection, and organizational bystanding.

André Spicer notes that the production of “talk” and “text” has become increasingly prevalent in organizational life and, furthermore, that these discourses constitute the social reality of organizations. He suggests that actually talk and text do not produce any aspect of organizational reality beyond, as he puts it, bullshit. Bullshit consists of all “discourse which is created, circulated and consumed” in organizational life “with little respect for or relationship to reality”. Bullshit has a performative function in the extent to which it empowers the “bullshitter”. Bullshit is not concerned with truth, it diverts attention from primary tasks of organization and enables bull-shitters to go about their own purposes. The more the immaterial context of an organization is filled with ambiguity and vagueness and the more it is empty of purpose and sense, the more bullshitters have the opportunity to cloak fundamentally ephemeral or even meaningless talk or text in a sophisticated garb. The continuous production of materials by the management fashion industry enables the exploitation of this excess of discourse by bullshitters. We may thus question our own role in this industry of bullshit! Bullshit can have positive returns however and may help, for instance, to back up an organization’s branding and legitimacy. Yet it remains true that it may “trigger a deep sense of affront among organizational members” and “severely undermine the trust” of stakeholders. Bullshit may sound like an entertaining concept but refers to the most unpleasant aspects of organizational life!

In a very different vein, Robert Chia continues his deconstruction of “spectacular” strategy thought that led him to suggest some avenues which challenge our underlying assumptions derived from the Western outlook. This traditional outlook generates and overestimates some persistent myths which tend to format our research traditions in strategy. These myths include concepts such as the direct and visible intervention of the heroic manager endowed with unique qualities and a calculative rationality, a quasi-mathematical and direct causality between discrete and decisive action and organizational performance as a whole. Chia roots his essay in process philosophy and Francois Jullien’s Chinese thought for two reasons. First, this allows him to demonstrate the weaknesses of a direct approach of strategy and its underlying consequentialist form of reasoning. Second, it enables

him to elaborate on strategic indirection as a more promising way to account for a more oblique and indirect form of engagement. This fresh perspective adopts an undetermined becoming worldview rather than a being one. It also acknowledges the existence of “unowned” (rather than owned) processes, which are seen as phenomena “taking place regardless of human intervention”. This immanent view of strategy concentrates upon silent transformations which, in Francois Jullien’s words, are implied in the strategic process so as to facilitate the conditions for the emergence of an outcome. The task of the strategist, a “sage”, is to turn the “potential at work in the configuration” into an opportunity; he does not tackle certain alleged strategic challenges head-on, instead maintaining an oblique approach and opting for “strategic inaction” in everyday organizational life.

Stephen Linstead’s paper similarly starts by deconstructing a vivid myth of organizational studies. With respect to any scandal or unethical behavior in organizations, researchers are used to documenting and labeling some “active”, direct or explicit behaviors and to distinguishing between, so to speak, the good, the bad and the ugly. Contrary to this style of thought, Stephen Linstead aims to offer an alternative to corruption, incompetence or collusion in explaining the formative contexts of escalating unethical action. He draws on the social psychology notion of bystanding, “an inability or refusal to look down the causal chain and acknowledge its human and social effects”. You know or witness some deviant and harmful actions but do nothing to stop or ameliorate it. This seems closer to the reality of everyday life in organizations. Linstead departs from a purely sociological notion to elaborate an organizational understanding of bystanding. In his words, organizational bystanding “reflects the state of non-involvement as a form of involvement, dissolution of any resolution to resist and a prelude to active involvement”. His essay points out the uniqueness of the organizational context for addressing bystanding. For instance, “bullying” may take forms that are not easy to discern and symbolic violence in organizational situations may not always be obvious, nor capable of direct confrontation. Organizations are also more formally interconnected ordinary worlds in which a large plurality of self- and collective interests overlaps. This highlights the need for “paradoxical thinking” but also makes bystanding more difficult in organizations. Bystanding behaviour requires critical efforts and faculties to understand what is really going on. Above all, the bystanding approach within organizations puts the responsibility of “being-in-relation” on the agenda of organization studies.

THE ART OF SPANNING, BALANCING CREATIVITY AND RIGOR IN OUR RESEARCH JOURNEYS

These four contributions address different aspect of a fundamental paradox in research in general, one that is perhaps even more salient in certain approaches of social sciences. It results from the tensions between rigor and creativity, genial ideas and well-constructed discovery processes, emotion and rationality. Far from offering solutions or choices, their combined efforts constitute an invitation to live with the paradox, to accept it as part of the job – or maybe as part of any human activity. So, “more of the opposites” seem to be the core message that we can take home.

First, we need a more precise and rational approach to how our practices are regulated. If we accept that no evaluation system will ever be perfect – and as Bill Starbuck's papers suggest, this offers a margin for manoeuvre that can be useful – it does not mean that we should not try to fix some of the most obvious problems and thus increase rigor. Joel Baum's paper is about exactly that. Considering the increasing importance of citation indices for journals, gaining some form of consensus on what is fair and trying to get the measures right is of importance. Accordingly, Baum proposes a solution to correct journal impact factors for citation quality. Indeed, well established journals benefit from the sensitivity to a few highly cited papers, when many others do not have such an impact. The result is that many articles published in these journals can "free-ride" on the reputation gained by the most cited ones. By adjusting journal impact factors according to relative number of citations, Baum shows how our perception of journal quality is changed, which is of course important in relation to individual evaluation.

While Bill Starbuck concurs in his article that the main processes regulating our field are imperfect, he demonstrates how this can be used to the profit of the creativity of research products. He describes how difficult it is for academics to get a clear perspective on what is happening in the field. This is due in particular to the ambiguity of messages about what constitutes good research. Depending on their research traditions and their personal backgrounds, reviewers and editors produce contradictory evaluations. This is partly due to the concentration of the publishing industry and also due to increasing pressure from the business school rating system, both of which reinforce the status quo. In concentrated industries, firms are used to repeating and protecting imperfect behaviors. However, Starbuck offers an optimistic conclusion, arguing that this situation of blundering randomly in disagreement can actually lead to more creativity in research if academics are ready to take risks. Indeed, the ambiguity of academic evaluation means that creative and risky research topics, methods and designs have their chance to be accepted and consequently our path is not as blocked as we might think as we might think. Starbuck suggests, however, that, to be accepted, authors should pay very close attention to any feed-back they can get before publication since this can provide useful data about possible audiences and thus constitutes a way to navigate their complex environment.

Yiannis Gabriel and James March further reflect on how and why creativity should be pursued and how and why it is likely to be rewarded and rewarding. Yiannis Gabriel both advocates and explains surprises as the sources of knowledge. He suggests that we must break free of assumptions and cross-fertilize and engage with different disciplines and ideas. Researchers have to break free of the tyranny of "purposiveness" and venture into less controlled territories. These are the territories of unmanaged inquiry, directed by pleasure rather than by purpose. Gabriel describes how, when the managed and the unmanaged (or perhaps "play" and "method") follow parallel paths, they can, in specific contexts, mesh. While Bill Starbuck's paper explains why ambiguity in our field creates a space of freedom, Yiannis Gabriel provides a teleological explanation in which pleasure is the drive. And indeed, our life as researchers would be very dull without unmanaged and playful ideas.

In the same vein, James March describes how beauty is more important than relevance. Playfulness is vital and has been an important driver to some of

the key ideas of our field, such as the “garbage can” model or the “temporal sorting in decision making” model. If we apply this model to the question of beauty, we understand how beautiful ideas can solve problems and perhaps realize that they are more likely to do so than ideas generated by the obsession of relevance. It should be noted, however, that March does not imply that the pursuit of relevance is unimportant, but rather that it should not come at the expense of playing with beautiful ideas. He rejoins Yiannis Gabriel when he writes that such ideas are sources of surprise, made of simplicity and fertility. He mentions some of the ideas that touched him over the years and includes two recent unpublished papers. Let’s hope that Bill Starbuck is right and that these beautiful ideas will find a space in our ambiguous field.

AN ON-GOING JOURNEY

The last paper is that of Bernard Forgues and Sébastien Liarte, two very important persons for *M@n@gement*. Bernard was the founder and the energy behind the journal for many years, and if we can celebrate a 15th Birthday, it is thanks to his relentless work for so many years to establish the journal. Bernard worked almost full time for many years on this, producing decisions of a very high standard while simultaneously handing out flyers at the Academy of Management. So, we would like to take the chance to thank him for this great success. And we are also happy to pass the baton to Sebastien, who was Editorial Assistant in the early days and who is the incoming Co-Editor in Chief along with Laure Cabantous. Their paper portrays the evolution of our field and describes the impact of the emergence of online journals and of the online access movement. This will help us to probe into the future of our field and forge an idea about what its future will be. This paper is our conclusion because it also tells the story of *M@n@gement*’s journey and delivers an optimistic message regarding its future. So, happy birthday, *M@n@gement*! And many happy returns!

Olivier Germain is Professor of Management and Entrepreneurship at the École des Sciences de la Gestion, Université du Québec à Montréal (Canada). He is also Regular Visiting Professor at Ecole de Management de Normandie (France). His research interests now focus on critical studies and process approaches in entrepreneuring.

Emmanuel Josserand is professor of management and Director of the Center for Management and Organization Studies at University of Technology, Sydney. His research interests are networks and identity. He served as Editor in Chief for *M@n@gement* from 2008 to 2013.

Acknowledgement

Very special thanks to Bernard Forgues who helped us to invite some of the authors. Thanks also to Laure Cabantous, Bernard Forgues, Yiannis Gabriel, James March, Grand Michelson, Rodolphe Durand, Viviane Sergi, André Spicer and Eero Vaara who helped us in the friendly reviewing process of essays. We would like to thank them for their very helpful comments and support. We are grateful to Walid Shibib for his impressive job of managing this anniversary issue.

REFERENCES

- Augier, M., & March, J. G. (2011). *The Roots, Rituals, and Rhetorics of Change: North American Business Schools After the Second World War*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Chanlat J.- F. (2008). L'analyse interculturelle et les sciences humaines. In E. Davel, J.- P. Dupuis, J.- F. Chanlat, *Gestion en contexte interculturel, Approches, problématiques, pratiques et plongées* (pp. 25-71). Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval et Télé-université.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Freedman, M. (1979). *Main trends in social and cultural anthropology*. New York: Holmes & Meier.
- Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, A. Z. (2007). Cross-Cultural Organizational Behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 479-514.
- Grey, C. (2010). Organization studies: Publications, politics and polemic. *Organization Studies*, 31(6), 677-694.
- Johnson, H. G. (1973). National styles in economic research: the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and various European countries. *Daedalus*, 102(2), 65-74.
- Lyytinen, K., Baskerville, R., Iivari, J., & Te'eni, D. (2007). Why the old world cannot publish? Overcoming challenges in publishing high-impact IS research. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 16(4), 317-326.
- Orlinsky, D. E. (1989). Researchers' images of psychotherapy: Their origins and influence on research. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 9(4), 413-441.
- Oswick, C., Fleming, P., & Hanlon, G. (2011). From Borrowing to Blending: Rethinking the Processes of Organizational Theory Building. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 318-337.
- Robinson-Pant, A. (2005). *Cross cultural perspectives in educational research*. Maidenhead ; New York: Open University Press.
- Santistevan, D., & Karjalainen, H. (2013). *How different cultures study culture differently*. Paper presented at the EGOS Conférence 2013, 4-6 juillet, Montréal.
- Sullivan, D. P., & Weaver, G. R. (2000). Cultural Cognition in International Business Research. *Management International review*, 40(3), 269-297.
- Tietze, S. (2013). Review of S. Montgomery's "Does Science need a Global Language? English and the Future of Research". *M@n@gement*, 16(3), 349-356.
- Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2011). Legitimizing Nascent Collective Identities: Coordinating Cultural Entrepreneurship. *Organization Science*, 22(2), 449-463.
- Zahra, S. A., & Newey, L. R. (2009). Maximizing the impact of organization science: Theory-building at the intersection of disciplines and/or fields. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(6), 1059-1075.
- Zimmerman, M. A., & Zeitz, G. D. (2002). Beyond survival: Achieving new venture growth by building legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(3), 414-431.